

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JACK AKSEL RODE,
Plaintiff,

vs.

FREDDIE MAC, J.P. MORGAN
CHASE, CHASE HOME FINANCE,
LLC, and THE COOPER CASTLE
LAW FIRM,

Defendants.

* * *

2:11-CV-01644-PMP-CWH

ORDER

Plaintiff Jack Aksel Rode is proceeding in this case Pro Se. On November 21, 2011, the Court entered an Order (Doc. #8) granting Plaintiff's Application for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* and directing the Clerk to file Plaintiff's Complaint. The Order further provided that Plaintiff shall have to and including December 12, 2011, within which to file a response to Defendants' pending Motion to Dismiss (Doc. #3).

However, Plaintiff Rode had already filed a response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss on November 7, 2011 (Doc. #5) and Defendants' had filed a Reply Memorandum (Doc. #6) on November 16, 2011. Additionally, on November 21, 2011, Plaintiff filed an Amendment to the Complaint (Doc. #7). On November 21, 2011, the Clerk of Court filed Plaintiff's original Complaint as (Doc. #9).

///

1 The Court finds it necessary to attempt to bring some coherence to
2 Plaintiff's pleadings to enable Defendants to Answer or otherwise respond. To do
3 so, the Court will require Plaintiff Rode to file a single Amended Complaint on or
4 before **January 5, 2012**, which shall, to the extent that Plaintiff wishes to do so,
5 combine the allegations contained in his original Complaint (Doc. #9) and his
6 Proposed Amendment to Complaint (Doc. #7).

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants shall have thereafter, to
9 and including **February 6, 2012**, within which to file an Answer or otherwise
10 respond to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Doc.
12 #3) is **DENIED** without prejudice to renew the same following the filing of
13 Plaintiff's Amended Complaint as authorized herein.

14
15 DATED: December 7, 2011.

16 

17
18

PHILIP M. PRO
United States District Judge